

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

R & D FILM 1, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Civil Action 2:12-cv-1120
Judge Michael H. Watson
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers**

DOES 272-352,

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff filed its Complaint in this action on December 5, 2012. On July 12, 2013, the Court ordered Plaintiff to amend its Complaint within thirty days to substitute in the real names for its Doe Defendants and to perfect service on those named parties as required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) or to alternatively show cause why the Court should not dismiss this action pursuant to Rule 4(m). (ECF No. 6.) To date, Plaintiff has not moved to amend its Complaint to substitute in the real names for its Doe Defendants. Nor has Plaintiff responded to the Court's Show Cause Order. Plaintiff did, however, file a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal With Prejudice as to Doe 352. (ECF No. 7.) It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that the Court dismiss the remaining Doe Defendants without prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m) for failure to timely effect service of process.

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the Report and

Recommendation, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *See, e.g., Pfahler v. Nat'l Latex Prod. Co.*, 517 F.3d 816, 829 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that “failure to object to the magistrate judge’s recommendations constituted a waiver of [the defendant’s] ability to appeal the district court’s ruling”); *United States v. Sullivan*, 431 F.3d 976, 984 (6th Cir. 2005) (holding that defendant waived appeal of district court’s denial of pretrial motion by failing to timely object to magistrate judge’s report and recommendation). Even when timely objections are filed, appellate review of issues not raised in those objections is waived. *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) (“[A] general objection to a magistrate judge’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not suffice to preserve an issue for appeal”) (citation omitted)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 21, 2013

/s/ Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers

Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers
United States Magistrate Judge